UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/647,362 | 08/25/2003 | Daniel R. Jacques | | 2223 |
| DANIEL R. JA | 7590 02/20/2007 COUES | EXAMINER | | |
| 900 Fifth Third Center 111 Loyon Street, N.W. Grand Rapids, MI 49503-2487 | | | DERAKSHANI, PHILIPPE | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| ,, | | | 3754 | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| SHORTENED STATUTOR | RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MONTHS | | 02/20/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/647,362 | JACQUES, DANIEL R. | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI | 3754 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | | |
| Period for Reply | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 November 2006</u> . | | | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Th | This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| .— | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,9-17,19-25 and 29-31</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8 and 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5, 9-17, 19-25 and 29-31</u> is/are re | ejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ | or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examir | ner. | | | | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summ | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application | | | | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other: | | | | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 9, 11-17, 21-22, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altenburger et al in view of Hench.

Altenburger et al show a tank 1, flow controller (63, 65, 43), pump assembly 7, 10 and liquid delivery system 22, 27 and 30. Altenburger et al lack a mixing chamber.

Hench show a mixing chamber for a gas and liquid to dispense a foam (column 2, lines 26-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Altenburger et al with a mixing chamber as taught by Hench to dispense a foam.

Claims 3-5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altenburger et al in view of Hench as applied to claim 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Hayes.

Altenburger et al lacks a feed line, an air control valve and a fitting defining a mixing chamber. Hayes shows a feed line 55 to introduce a pressurized gas, an air control valve 60 to adjust the air pressure and a fitting 61 to generate foam. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Altenburger et al device with a feed line to introduce a pressurized gas an air control valve and a fitting

Application/Control Number: 10/647,362

Art Unit: 3754

defining a mixing chamber as taught by Hayes to control the air pressure and to generate a foam.

Re claim 10 official notice has been taken that pressure release valves for pressurized containers are well known and therefore it would have been on obvious choice in design to modify Altenburger with a pressure release valve. Also admits on page 8 that a pressure release valve and a feed line are conventional accessories.

Claims 19-20, 24-25 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altenburger et al in view of Hench and Hayes as applied to claims 22, 23 and 29 above, and further in view of Petit et al.

The Altenburger et al/Hench device lack a mixing medium. Petit et al show a mixing medium 10 to facilitate mixing and to prevent debris from being dispensed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Altenburger et al/Hench device with a mixing medium as taught by Petit et al to facilitate mixing and to prevent debris from being dispensed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 9-17, 19-25 and 29-31 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI whose telephone number is 571-272-4925. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hour days.

Art Unit: 3754

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LILIPPE S DERAKSHANI

Arimary Examiner

PD 2/15/07